

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Of these, claims 1, 14 and 21 are independent. Claims 1, 13, 14, 20, 21 and 32 are sought to be amended. In addition, the specification is sought to be amended. Applicant believes that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because Figures 11 and 13-15 do not include reference sign(s) mentioned in the description. Applicants has amended the specification to include only reference sign(s) illustrated in Figures 11 and 13-15. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Approval and entry of these proposed amendments are respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to Figures 11 and 13-15.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because Figures 7, 9, 11 and 16 include reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description. Applicants have amended the specification to include reference sign 720 in Figure 7, reference sign 915 in Figure 9, reference sign 1105 in Figure 11 and reference sign 1635 in Figure 16. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Approval and entry of these proposed amendments are

respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to Figures 7, 9, 11 and 16.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Approval and entry of these proposed amendments are respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 21-22 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,600,573 to Hendricks et al. ("Hendricks") in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0152474 to Dudkiewicz ("Dudkiewicz"). Claims 13 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Dudkiewicz and further in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0162120 to Mitchell ("Mitchell"). Claims 3, 14-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al. ("Hendricks 585") and further in view of Dudkiewicz. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Hendricks 585 and further in view of Mitchell. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to pending claims 1-32 since Hendricks, Dudkiewicz, Mitchell, and Hendricks 585, either taken alone or in combination, do

not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 14 and 21 (and thus their dependent claims 2-13, 15-20 and 22-32) for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 14 and 21 have been amended to include a similar feature of executing said transmission of said packets of content data according to said playlist and a transmission policy, wherein the transmission policy includes one or more properties describing how said packets of content data should be transmitted over a delivery network. Applicants assert that Hendricks, Dudkiewicz, Mitchell, and Hendricks 585, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 14 and 21 (and their dependent claims 2-13, 15-20 and 22-32) are patentable over Hendricks, Dudkiewicz, Mitchell, and Hendricks 585, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Intel Corporation

Dated: July 26, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-3311

P11540 Amendment_Reply

I, **Julie Dussault**, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on **July 26, 2006**.


(Signature of person mailing correspondence)